

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 081 368

HE 004 537

AUTHOR Henry, David D.
TITLE Coordination and Cooperation in Higher Education in
Massachusetts.
INSTITUTION Academy for Educational Development, Inc.,
Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Feb 73
NOTE 34p.
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Cooperative Planning; *Educational Administration;
*Educational Coordination; Educational Policy;
*Higher Education; *Interinstitutional Cooperation;
*Statewide Planning
IDENTIFIERS *Massachusetts

ABSTRACT

For a number of years college and university administrators, government officials, and legislators, both state and federal, have striven to achieve better interinstitutional cooperation and coordination in higher education. This report treats the topic of cooperation and coordination by answering the following questions: (1) How can the state of Massachusetts plan more effectively for higher education? (2) Is a regional structure likely to be useful for higher education planning in Massachusetts? (3) How can the views of the legislature and the public be fed more adequately into the higher education planning mechanism in Massachusetts? (4) How can interinstitutional cooperation and coordination be fostered in Massachusetts? (5) How can competitive expansion, duplication of efforts, and waste of funds be avoided in Massachusetts? To more fully understand these questions, the report describes the relationship between Massachusetts public and private institutions; explains the aspirations, obligations and responsibilities of Massachusetts public institutions; and outlines the position of the Massachusetts Advisory Council on Education. (Author/PG)

ED 081368

COORDINATION AND COOPERATION IN HIGHER
EDUCATION IN MASSACHUSETTS

By

David D. Henry
Formerly President,
University of Illinois

Report Prepared For

Academy for Educational Development
1424 - 16th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

February 1973

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT
OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE 004 537

TABLE OF CONTENTS .

	PAGE
Introduction	1
Factor #1. Relationship Between Private and Public Institutions	3
Factor #2. The Aspirations, Obligations and Responsibilities of the Public Institutions	6
Factor #3. The Massachusetts Advisory Council on Education	10
Question #1. How can the State of Massachusetts plan more effectively for higher education?	11
Question #2. Is a regional structure likely to be useful for higher education planning in Massachusetts?	15
Question #3. How can the views of the Legislature be fed more adequately into the higher education planning mechanism in Massachusetts?	17
Question #4. How can inter-institutional cooperation and coordination be fostered in Massachusetts?	23
Question #5. How can competitive expansion, duplication of efforts, and waste of funds be avoided in Massachusetts?	23
Concluding Notes	23
Addendum	26
Appendix A	29

COORDINATION AND COOPERATION
IN HIGHER EDUCATION
IN MASSACHUSETTS

By David D. Henry*

Introduction

For a number of years college and university administrators, government officials, and legislators, both state and federal, have striven to achieve better inter-institutional cooperation and coordination in higher education. Today, as a decade ago, the concept is widely applauded and seldom accomplished as conceived. The goal turns out to be elusive and isolated achievements are frequently off-set by negative developments. Nation-wide and in individual states and regions, we seem to be no closer now than in the past to accomplishing the objectives that have been set out in strong language in legislation and in educational policy statements and for whose implementation elaborate machinery has been established.

The very terms "coordination" and "cooperation" have become ambiguous. When they are used in higher education or their concepts implemented, there are many who are unsure about who is doing what to whom, and under what circumstances.**

*The opinions, conclusions and recommendations in this report are those of the author, and do not necessarily represent the policy of the Academy for Educational Development.

**See The Capitol and the Campus, State Responsibility for Post-secondary Education, a Report and Recommendations by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, "Coordination and Planning," p. 23-37; McGraw Hill Book Co., New York, April 1971.

It is against this national background that the Academy for Educational Development asked for comment on a number of questions that have been included in the Massachusetts Higher Education study. Specifically, the questions were:

1. How can the State of Massachusetts plan more effectively for higher education?
2. Is a regional structure likely to be useful for higher education planning in Massachusetts?
3. How can the views of the Legislature and the public be fed more adequately into the higher education planning mechanism in Massachusetts?
4. How can inter-institutional cooperation and coordination be fostered in Massachusetts?
5. How can competitive expansion, duplication of efforts, and waste of funds be avoided in Massachusetts?

In order to update my background on the higher education situation in Massachusetts, particularly with respect to cooperation and coordination among the various institutions and segments in the state, I visited with a number of college and university executives and government officials, studied a number of reports and documents already prepared, and then discussed the questions being raised in this study with the local members of the study staff. My responses to the questions have been influenced, in part, by my observations of the higher education situation in Massachusetts as I found it and by my conversations with those whom I interviewed. This memorandum presents first a number of the factors involved, and then turns to the questions as listed.

At the start, I emphasize that I am not taking any position on the Governor's reorganization plan. I share the point of view that the functions of coordination, cooperation, and planning will have to be carried out, whatever structure for implementation is given the responsibility.

Factor #1. The Relationship Between Private and Public Institutions

Today the relationships between private and public institutions of higher education are a dominant factor in any study of higher education in the state. The nature of these relationships has major implications with respect to planning for the future of higher education in Massachusetts.

In the private sector there is widespread apprehension as to:

1. The adequacy of future financial resources to underwrite a continuation of the present quality and scope of programs being offered.

This concern varies from worry over the financial ability of maintaining past and present strength to an outright insecurity as to the future stability of entire institutions.

The "budget crunch" is emphasized by the possibility that tuition revenue will decline as the result of a prospective

reduction in enrolment, occasioned by either (a) increasing tuition costs without adequate student assistance; or (b) the expansion by public colleges and universities into areas directly competitive, geographically or financially, with programs already established in private institutions; or (c) a decline in senior college and university enrolments in general.

2. The impending competition for part-time students both in formal and in informal non-credit work, particularly in the Boston area.

On a unit-cost accounting basis the education of part-time students is frequently just as expensive to the institution as that of a full-time student. From a pragmatic administrative point of view, however, the cost of space, common services and overhead are chargeable generally to the full-time student body regardless of the part-time load. Hence, revenue from part-time students is an important "add on" in the budget of many private institutions, particularly the large ones located in big cities. Competition for part-time students at the undergraduate level, therefore, clearly provides a potential for institutional conflict. The more specialized the curriculum, the more intense will be the competition.

3. Possible competition for regular full-time undergraduate students (a concern everywhere, but one that was not urgent in Massachusetts in the fall of 1972).

Although no less than 60% of the full-time students in Massachusetts are now enrolled in private colleges and universities, these institutions draw heavily also from the pool of young people located outside of the state. Enrolment projection studies now being made in Massachusetts, as elsewhere in the country, indicate that the outlook for full-time undergraduate enrolment is unclear. In a few years the number in traditional senior institutions may well decline.

4. Duplication of educational programs at the doctoral and advanced professional levels.

Here costs are relatively very high. Educators at both state-supported and private institutions should be sure that the resources of each are allocated within an appropriate "division of labor." The introduction of new programs at public institutions which are similar to those already existing at the private universities (and for which there is already a dim prospect of enrolment expansion) bears careful examination. When public or private institutions offer new programs to

students which parallel or duplicate existing programs that appear to be sufficient for enrolment demand, the result will only add to the long-range fiscal problems of both the private and public institutions. When a new program is offered at a lower net cost to the student, under such circumstances, conflict is inevitable.

An amelioration of these apprehensions is clearly necessary before it is possible to create an atmosphere for cooperative endeavor leading to state-wide planning for higher education and for a responsible utilization of existing educational resources. In Massachusetts the private sector is one of the largest concentrations of public service being provided by private institutions in the nation. It is both an economic and cultural asset to the State. Public policy should take into account not only the preservation but also the enhancement of that asset. New programs and innovations cannot, therefore, be the exclusive domain of the public institutions.

Factor #2. The Aspirations, Obligations and Responsibilities of the Public Institutions

The future development of the public universities and colleges clouds the public-private relationships and some resolution of the mutual concerns should have high priority in the consideration of state planning in Massachusetts. During the past decade the development of the public institutions has been the source of considerable

state pride. The enlargement and expansion of the University of Massachusetts, both in the scope of its programs and in its academic reputation, the growth of the state colleges and the development of the community colleges, all attest to the fact that there was a great need to which they were able to respond.

As students of higher education know, Massachusetts was somewhat tardy among the states of the Union in establishing a clear and definitive role for its public universities and colleges and in giving them a high priority in financial support. Although much progress has been made in recent years, the total state effort has not exceeded that of other states. This comparison may be made whether the measurement is made on the basis of per capita personal income in the state, per capita expenditure made on higher education, or per capita taxes levied for higher educational purposes.

It may reasonably be concluded, therefore, that Massachusetts has not overdone its effort. Indeed the contrary is true; that is, that the state must continue to be concerned about the development of excellence, expanding the adequacy of programs in the various universities and colleges under its direct control, and of considering new programs when the need is fully justified.

There should be no serious disagreement with the general premise that:

- state supported institutions of higher education have a vital public mission
- Massachusetts has a potential for the fulfillment of that mission on a par with other states and
- Massachusetts should support those institutions in a way that is at least comparable with other industrial states.

There remains, however, the question of how best to carry on the development, the best method to use, how best to serve the public interest without (a) harming the private institutions vitally and (b) encouraging at the same time a philosophy of "left-over" service to be provided by the state-supported institutions. To say, as some do, that public institutions should carry on only those activities that are not being handled by private colleges and universities is to deny the basic responsibility of public higher education.

No state has adopted such a policy, and it cannot be adopted without damage to the welfare of the people of the state.

A public university has a group of functions in teaching, research, and public service. Once these have been set forth and approved in support of broad objectives, the institution should be expected to develop effectively, but also planfully. "Planfully" is a key word. There must be plans for both public and private institutions, and they must be related to each other.

Prior to the improvement in the relationships between the public and the private sectors there is need, however, to share in arrangements for planning, communication with respect to present and future planning, and to establish ways and means for mutual consideration of what is ultimately best for both the student and the Commonwealth. At the present time each institution in the state, public or private, believes that what it is doing now and what it plans for the future is in the best interest of the Commonwealth. Clearly, inter-institutional conversation on this subject is essential. Also, in order to be meaningful, it must be joint and practical and directed to specific issues and problems.

With both public and private institutions under pressure to economize and to make the best possible use of all the resources available, the time is favorable for a new look at cooperative planning. On the agenda should be such matters as:

- the availability of public assistance for both full-time and part-time students
- the adjustment of charges to students in relationship to scholarship assistance
- the establishment of machinery for exchange of information in program planning and
- the establishment of procedures for initiative in organization and follow up in joint planning.

Both the public and the private sectors of higher education could gain a good deal from a common stance on these four topics.

Factor #3. The Massachusetts Advisory Council on Education

Massachusetts is unusual among the states in having established an Advisory Council on Education as an independent agency. In my view the Council is well conceived, and has done useful work through the studies that it has sponsored. In any future organization and structure of higher education in Massachusetts the Council or a similar type organization* ought to be a major contributor to the success of the process of planning and coordination.

If one conceives of coordination as a result and not a process, and of educational autonomy as essential within a broad consensus as to the major divisions and parameters of a master plan, it is clear that the Massachusetts Advisory Council can play a unique role. The Council is neither an advocate of any educational position nor is it an administrative body. It is not subject to political or special influence by any one constituency. It has been, is now, and should continue to be an independent force in its judgments.

The Council should be in a position, through its studies, to have an evaluative influence upon the conditions of master planning, as well as upon the recommendations made by the various segments and by the agencies of state government. Hence, it can and, in my opinion, should become a constructive balance wheel in the machinery for

*Under the Governor's Reorganization Plans the Massachusetts Education Council will absorb the Advisory Council and two other councils.

planning and coordination of higher education. It can serve as a public forum for the people of Massachusetts when conflict situations develop and when issues and problems are caught up between advocates and adversaries.

In some states, the coordinating agency has become subject to a measure of political influence either from the dominant party, a dominant executive, a legislature, or a combination of these power centers. This is not desirable for education decision-making. Somebody outside the master planning and coordinating agency should be available, therefore, for monitoring planning procedures, for being sure that the whole case in each major issue is put before the public and that there is a public forum for review. In Massachusetts, the Advisory Council could undertake this role.

* * *

This paper turns now to the specific questions on inter-institutional planning, cooperation, and coordination.

Question #1. How can the State of Massachusetts plan more effectively for higher education?

Comment:

Within the public sector in Massachusetts, it seems to me that the long-range planning of the various segments has until now left

something to be desired. State-wide coordination will not occur within the system as a whole until there is maximum coordination among the members of each segment. The idea of segments or systems of comparable institutions is a sound one, but long-range planning within the segments should proceed concurrently with long-range planning for the state. The two should be part of the same process. Intra-segment coordination and planning are also parts of the process of collaboration and cooperation with other segments and with the private sector.

Agreement with this analysis will produce no results, however, unless initiative for intra- and inter-group action is taken. Where should the initiative lie? Under present law, the governance authority of each segment clearly has the responsibility for integrated planning among its members. Because such planning has implications for state-wide activity, the Board of Higher Education also has substantial responsibility.*

Recommendations:

1. The Board of Higher Education should be encouraged to conduct discussion of ways and means to advance intra- and inter-segment planning and planning between the segments and private institutions. Special staff should be provided for this purpose, both to the Board and to the

*Under the Governor's Reorganization plan, the Board of Post-secondary Education would have the responsibility.

segment administrations. For the purposes of this recommendation, the consortia should be regarded as a segment. Special arrangements should be made for discussions of inter-institutional functions in the Boston area.

Today a formal overall consortium is impossible in the Boston area because there are too many institutions, and they are too diverse in purpose, size, character, and program. A consortium approach could be made upon certain functional lines, however, such as the providing of services to part-time students or to persons enrolled in specific professional programs, such as law and dentistry or in doctoral programs in education.

2. The Board of Higher Education should ask the Association of Independent Colleges and Universities in Massachusetts to appoint a committee to serve in an advisory role, parallel to the present advisory committee composed of representatives of the public segments. Occasional joint meetings of the two groups might be held, but for the present parallel independent groups may well be more effective, although they would be expected to work closely together.
3. If the Board is continued as a government agency after the General Court considers the Governor's Reorganization Plan, its membership should be made up exclusively of laymen not

identified as trustees or employees of any of the sectors involved.

4. Both public and private colleges and universities should give every possible exposure to management data, to the characteristics of administrative policies and to short-range and long-range plans and operations. For sound decisions, the public consideration and debate of data, policy, and planning is essential.

State assisted planning is public business and ought to be publicly discussed and be a matter of public record. Essential communication cannot be established unless the planning process is open and the professional relationships accepted in good faith. Public evaluation of planning and corollary political decisions cannot be sound without such public visibility of the professional planning and the reasons for it.

5. The Massachusetts Advisory Council should be encouraged to expand its program of studies and enlarge its role to that of a forum for public review of critical issues in higher education. Its studies should include evaluative reports and studies of institutions, systems, state and agency procedures, and educational needs of the Commonwealth.

Question #2. Is a regional structure likely to be useful for higher education planning in Massachusetts?

Comment:

Regional planning within the state has much to commend it. Higher education institutions are economic assets to their regions. They provide unique services to commuting students. They are spurs to economic growth. Often they provide for local professional expertise through their recruitment of professional personnel for permanent residence in the community. They provide centers of continuing education and recreation. The experience has been that practically every institution of higher learning has something unique to give to its region.

However, regionalism can be parochial and inappropriately political. Hence, regionalism expressed through consortia, and thus brought into the state-wide picture, can have the advantage of both local perspective and the broader interest.

The economic and administrative advantages of geographic consortia have been well demonstrated in the groups at Amherst and Worcester. The Southeastern Massachusetts institutions should be encouraged to develop the relationships already initiated. The special arrangements suitable for the Boston area are mentioned on page 13 .

With reference to regional planning on an inter-state basis, I consider the Durham Declaration* of the Presidents of the Public Universities of New England to be a remarkable document. The Declaration is a strong and statesman-like exposition of both a need and an opportunity and should prepare the way for specific program planning as quickly as possible. The Declaration makes clear that the Presidents are dedicated to cooperation where trans-state relationships can be mutually beneficial.

The Presidents have marked the areas of cooperation and collaboration that can be most meaningful, such as graduate school development, professional schools, extension and continuing educational programs, and certain innovations such as common international programs and an "open university."

However, resolutions do not produce results -- people must work at programs.

Recommendations:

1. The State of Massachusetts should take the initiative in encouraging a New England regional approach to the supply of highly specialized expensive education in selected

*Inasmuch as the Durham Declaration issued in Durham, New Hampshire, on November 20, 1973, does not seem to have had widespread publicity, a copy is included with this memorandum as Appendix A for the convenience of the reader.

professional fields and technical areas. Veterinary medicine is an example. The New England Board of Higher Education should be prepared to be the agent for such inquiry and to foster the establishment of appropriate administrative mechanisms.

2. The Presidents of the Land-Grant Universities should make every effort to carry out the objectives of the Durham Declaration and the General Court should provide separate funds for this purpose.
3. Since planning requires personnel both for expertise and administrative initiative and follow through, funds for these purposes should be provided to the segments, including the consortia, and the state agency concerned.

Question #3. How can the views of the Legislature be fed more adequately into the higher education planning mechanism in Massachusetts?

Comment:

According to a recent survey.* many legislators are restive about the nature of their involvement with higher education decision-making.

*State Officials and Higher Education: A Survey of the Opinions and Expectations of Policymakers in Nine States, by H. Bulau and H. Quinley, a report prepared for the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education; McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, 1970.

First, they are concerned that they do not systematically receive sufficient first-hand information on which to base informed judgments on legislation before them. Of course, this generalization is true about many areas of public business, and legislators acknowledge that they are dependent upon leadership and committees for guidance and upon the degree of their confidence in the recommending agencies and agents. More and more, however, as higher education assumes greater importance in state finance, they feel impelled to be better informed in greater depth than they are now.

Second, beyond the desire to be informed on higher education as a financial matter, legislators have unusual interest in higher education, per se. Many of them feel close to the subject, as products of the system, and many have ideas for its improvement that they feel ought to have consideration. Some of these proposals reflect the interests of their constituents, some originate in their own experience.

It is to be noted in connection with both points that while delegation of a large share of responsibility for policy recommendations to institutional and coordinating agencies has been necessary to expedite business, legislators desire some direct involvement that will be personal and authentic. Because the effectiveness of institutional operations and many policy determinations will result from legislative action, the desire for participation ought to be encouraged, not discouraged.

Over time, many devices and procedures have been tried in an effort to improve legislative relations to higher education. For example, in the past it was possible to arrange group visits to campuses. Some states established official committees for visits to educational institutions. Some placed members of the legislature on advisory boards.

Today, however, ad hoc, haphazard, casual, and almost accidental relationships are no longer adequate to keep legislators informed or to serve as an appropriate channel for communication from individual legislators or committees to planning and policy agencies.

Recommendations:

1. The legislature should create a joint committee on higher education, not to supplant or compete with appropriation or education committees now existing, but to be responsible for establishing channels for legislative involvement in the preliminary processes leading to final action. The Committee would be advisory, would send observers regularly to the meetings of the Board of Higher Education and would digest reports that should be communicated to the members of the legislature.

2. Between sessions of the legislature, campus visitations and discussion should be scheduled, perhaps two a year, rotated among the segments, including the private institutions as a segment. These visits and programs would be sponsored by the joint committee on higher education.
3. The Advisory Council on Education should conduct annually a structured conference on issues and problems in higher education in Massachusetts with the program planned in consultation with legislative leaders and segment heads and the Board of Higher Education. Proceedings should be made available to all members of the legislature and other specialized audiences. Trends of discussion should be reported, as well as analytical papers.
4. The Board of Higher Education should conduct a survey of members of the legislature and of the institutional and segment heads on how it is possible to increase the involvement of the members of the legislature in the planning mechanisms of higher education. As background, the experiences of other states could be procured from the Commission of the States.

Question 4 How can inter-institutional cooperation be fostered in Massachusetts?

Comment:

Although some of the comments and recommendations given above to questions number 1, 2, and 3 relate also to question number 4,* I shall list in this section only those that pertain to consortia.

Massachusetts is fortunate in that there are arrangements for developing consortia and a growing acceptance of the efficacy of voluntary cooperation through consortia.

The organization of private and public institutions in the Worcester area where the institutions work together in the implementation of plans and the similar but older arrangements at Amherst provide good experience from which to build. An incipient possibility exists in southeastern Massachusetts where conversations about cooperative enterprises have already been started.

In the Boston area dozens of bilateral agreements already exist among neighboring institutions. This suggests that the time has come for a systematic and more extensive pattern of relationships. Here as indicated earlier, it is probable that cooperative machinery would have to be organized around common functions and student constituencies rather than around the institutions themselves.

*specifically, see pages 12-15, 16-17, and 19-20 of this memorandum.

Recommendations:

1. The establishment of consortia and other methods of inter-institutional cooperation should be encouraged whenever possible.
2. The state should study seriously how to relate the operations of the commissions established under Section 1202 of the Educational Amendments of 1972 to the present or new machinery for state planning.
3. The state might formalize relationships to consortia so that it would be legally possible to make direct grants or appropriations to them for inter-institutional activities without amending the Constitution.
4. The state should provide administrative and planning funds for consortia to the extent possible under the Constitution. One way to be considered would be the assignment of jointly selected personnel from the Board of Higher Education.
5. Once legal barriers are removed the state could enter into contracts with consortia to provide necessary educational services.

Question #5. How can competitive expansion, duplication of efforts, and waste of funds be avoided in Massachusetts?

Comment:

The Comment and Recommendations developed under the previous four questions covers the import of Question #5.

All that has been said in this paper has been directed to ways and means of avoiding competitive expansion, duplication of efforts and unnecessary expenditure of funds. However, the thrust has been positive, also: the enhancement of assets, the conservation and responsible use of resources, and how best to serve the Commonwealth.

Concluding Notes

Policy formulation is always affected by the organization and administration established to implement policy. Although organization per se has been excluded from the purview of this study, one cannot fail to note that the Governor's reorganization recommendations to the legislature have placed a constraint upon initiative of all agents, agencies, and institutions included in the planning of higher education in Massachusetts.

The prevailing mood is one of uncertainty as to future responsibilities and possibilities. Hence, whatever changes may be adopted

should be evaluated by those who will have the responsibility for implementation. Little forward movement toward planning and cooperation as here recommended can be expected until present organization proposals are determined.

One caveat should be entered on this point. Coordination, desired by all parties, is a resulting condition, not a procedure. Coordination at its best is not imposed. It arises from the various elements in consensus-seeking that have been described in this report. Responsibility for initiative in master planning must be established, but the substance of the master plan should be determined after appropriate input has been solicited and weighed, the parameters determined, and respect for institutional autonomy to the fullest possible extent established. Efficiency cannot be attained without a high degree of autonomy.

On the other hand, enough authority must accompany master planning to deal with the minority who will not be a party to a consensus. Here, however, the authority should be limited, based upon the realization that in the end the people of the state must determine the policies -- not bureaucracy. Accordingly, the General Court should not expect to withdraw entirely from involvement in major policy decision as regards scope and goals. Fiscal responsibility requires a measure of policy responsibility. The legislature must reflect the wishes of the people at large as well as their own views of the operations of the higher education community.

The effectiveness of state planning rests with the willingness of the individual institutions to participate and to work with others in the attack on larger problems. Such willingness and desire will be expressed only when there is no threat, direct or indirect, to the institution's established mission, when there is no possibility of authoritative regimentation or political domination. Continuing collaboration within a framework of agreement is essential to constructive outcomes. No institution, public or private, should regard what is best for the state as a whole as in any way inimical to its own development.

In setting up the devices for master planning and coordination, in calling for new initiatives in the spirit of mutual concern, there is always the temptation to look to machinery as the answer to problem solving. Machinery does not solve problems -- people do. Massachusetts has been forward-looking in the establishment of organizational structures -- the establishment of a state agency for master planning in higher education, the creation of the Advisory Council on Education, the development of consortia, the establishment of new campuses and new institutions within the major segments, and the organization of the major segments.

The task ahead is one for leadership, for initiative, for the development of a spirit of cooperative enterprise, and above all for the provision of resources to make effective planning possible. The

sums required are not large, relatively. They should be regarded as investments in future efficiency.

Addendum

During the course of the visits with educators and administrators in Massachusetts and the study of the documents on higher education in the Commonwealth, a number of matters arose which were beyond the precise scope of the questions assigned to me by the Academy. This memorandum provides an opportunity, however, to comment on these matters, also.

1. The levying of tuitions at public institutions.

Tuitions imposed by public institutions are a form of selective tax imposed by the state on persons who use the services offered. The state imposes many selective taxes on users, such as the tax on gasoline for the use of highways, and authorizes the imposition of taxes by other governmental bodies, such as taxes on the use of water provided by cities to citizens, etc. Sometimes the tax on users is a charge which has a direct relationship to the cost of producing the services provided and is in the nature of a price. Sometimes this is not the case. In any event, the distinction is blurred. However, only in the case of the state-wide tax levied on students in the form of tuition is the amount to be levied determined exclusively and without any reference to cost or other criteria by members

of appointed boards rather than by persons who are the elected representatives of the people. In my view, the amount of tuition levied on students should be determined by the legislature, not by governing boards. Moreover, since there is no necessary relationship between the amount charged and the cost of services provided in the several institutions, it seems to me that the tuition pattern should be uniform for all public colleges and universities in the state.

2. Scholarship assistance for part-time students.

Throughout the history of higher education in this country, a part-time student has been treated much less adequately than the full-time student. One area of discrimination is with respect to scholarship awards, which in general exclude part-time students altogether.

In Massachusetts, as elsewhere in the country, there is likely to be a great increase in the number of part-time students in the next five to ten years. They are likely to be a substantially greater proportion of the total enrollment (on a head count basis) than they are now. The state should, it seems to me, be sensitive to the financial needs of part-time students, and where they are entitled to assistance should provide aid on a pro-rata basis similar to that provided to full-time students.

3. Inter-institutional contracts.

The legal barriers that prohibit contracting arrangements between public and private institutions of higher education at the present time should be eliminated as quickly as possible by amending the state constitution. This arrangement can be useful to the State, and, if adopted, could be highly productive in selected areas of cooperation.

4. Emphasis upon common goals.

In serving the Commonwealth and the citizens of Massachusetts, the private and the public colleges and universities have more in common than their public differences suggest. However, the atmosphere of apprehension, as previously described, does give rise to the building of separate constituencies and to the development of divisive attitudes. Polarizing the general community on higher education issues would be exceedingly unfortunate for the welfare of higher education in Massachusetts, for the State, and for each of the components. Such a development is more than a theoretical possibility. The beginning of such division has already been noted. It is important therefore that additional sophisticated lay leadership, with substantial public visibility, be brought into the planning and governance operations at all levels and in all agencies and segments for the benefit of the Commonwealth as a whole.

APPENDIX ATHE DURHAM DECLARATION OF THE PRESIDENTS
OF THE PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES OF NEW ENGLAND*

The Presidents of the six land-grant public universities of New England, meeting in Durham, New Hampshire, for their fourth formal session of the year, have continued their efforts to broaden and strengthen their established pattern of regional cooperation. We recognize that mounting demands for public higher education of high quality finds New England at a crossroads. Generations behind most of the United States in its realization of the need for support, our region has made impressive strides in the development of its public universities and colleges in the last decade. Expanded enrollments, improved facilities, better faculties, greater service to our states are among our genuine accomplishments. Those advances have required increasing investments of tax money. Today, there is a proper and growing public concern that our universities are effective institutions -- creating knowledge, imparting knowledge, reaching out to those who need us most. There is also proper concern that university programs are well-planned, well-managed and well-coordinated with one another and with the private institutions of higher education that are so

*Issued on November 20, 1972 at Durham, New Hampshire

rich a resource in New England. As Presidents of the six public universities, we believe we carry a special obligation to organize our progress so that we strengthen the overall pattern of higher education in our region, public and private alike. Accordingly, each of us has been engaged in our own states in participating in consortia and other collaborative arrangements. For many years we have been partners with our private colleagues in New England Board of Higher Education. We are proud of the outreach and special educational activities of the New England Center here in Durham. We believe we have built a sensible, wholesome, intramural and intercollegiate athletic program. Now we believe it is time to take another major step forward; a common planning and coordination in our academic and public service areas. Specifically, we believe we can better our educational offerings and improve our cost effectiveness if---

First, we plan the course of our graduate school developments together.

Universities by the very nature of their calling, must carry on graduate education of high quality. But we believe we can shape together an overall program that gives each institution sufficient strength and depth in faculty and research challenge and at the same time avoids duplication and destructive competition.

Second, we will continue to examine our common capacity for region-wide profession schools located at a single site. For some time, proposals for various New England professional

schools, such as in undertaking new field of health services, have been under popular discussion. We believe that we should now determine the genuine needs for such undertakings, and if they are demonstrated, initiate them together. We should also evaluate the ways our present professional schools and colleges can be made to complement one another.

Third, we will undertake to strengthen, streamline, and rationalize our extension and continuing educational programs. The New England region is compact; our six states taken together fit four times within the borders of Texas. We think we can devise a genuine regional extension capability that can help our communities and improve the status and morale of the faculties and staffs involved.

Fourth, since New England with the rest of America, looks increasingly toward shared activities with our other nations, we believe we can develop further common international programs. The recent New England-Japan Trade Conference here at the New England Center is a good example of our potential. The international study exchange programs for students and faculties are another. We believe that we can systematically develop relations with universities across the world that can yield enormous economic cultural and social benefits to our states.

Finally, the concept of an open university easily available to all who desire has excited the professional educator and citizen alike.

We have the obligation to explore the concept on a regional basis and already proposals exist in several of our states to

use public television, regional centers and special courses to that end.

Given our conviction that these five areas of collaboration hold high promise, we have asked Don Nicoll of Maine, a distinguished New Englander with a long record of public service to our region, to analyze how we can realize our academic and service aims and to make specific recommendations as to organization and procedure. We hope to have the Nicoll study before us early in 1973 and to be able to present to our boards of trustees, and through them to the people of our states, a realistic plan of action next year. Our expectation is that we can establish arrangements that will dramatically improve the combined value of our institutions and the effectiveness with which we work.

In the meantime, we will accelerate our existing endeavors in athletics and continuing education. We ask all New Englanders concerned with the future of their region and their children to support us in our work.